arXiv:1704.00652v1 [math.CO] 3 Apr 2017

Transfer-Matrix Methods meet Ehrhart Theory

Alexander Engström Florian Kohl

April 4, 2017

Abstract

Transfer-Matrix Methods originated in physics where they were used to count the number of allowed particle states on a structure whose width n is a parameter. Typically the number of states is exponential in n. One more mathematical instance of this methodology is to enumerate the proper vertex colorings of a graph of growing size by a fixed number of colors.

In Ehrhart theory, lattice points in the dilation of a fixed polytope by a factor k are enumerated. By inclusion-exclusion, relevant conditions on how the lattice points interact with hyperplanes are enforced. Typically the number of points are (quasi-) polynomial in k. The text-book example is that for a fixed graph, the number of proper vertex colorings with k colors is polynomial in k.

This paper investigates the joint enumeration problem with both parameters n and k free. We start off with the classical graph colorings and then explore the common situations in combinatorics related to Ehrhart theory. We show how symmetries can be explored to reduce calculations and explain the interactions with Discrete Geometry.

1 Introduction

This paper consists of two parts, both sharing a common philosophy. The first (and longer) part (Section 3 to Section 5) focusses on proper graph colorings of the Cartesian graph products $G \times P_n$ and $G \times C_n$. where P_n and C_n are the path and the cycle graph on n nodes, respectively. Here both k and n are variables. In particular, the size of the graph is not fixed. In order to determine the doubly asymptotic behavior of the number of proper k-colorings, we combine transfer-matrix methods with Ehrhart theory. This problem has direct applications to physics: If G is a molecular structure, then $G \times P_n$ corresponds to several connected layers of the molecular structure. The k colors correspond to k different states of the atoms. Then counting the number of possible combinations is the same as counting the number of colorings. If we furthermore assume that two adjacent atoms are not allowed to be in the same state, we arrive at a classical proper coloring problem. Since n is very large in physical systems and also k may vary, the (doubly or single) asymptotic behavior is of interest.

This problem lies at the intersection of transfer-matrix methods and proper graph colorings. For fixed k, one can use the transfer-matrix method to count the number of proper k-colorings of $G \times P_n$ and $G \times C_n$. Section 3 introduces the transfer-matrix method and shows how it can be applied to this set-up. Transfer-matrix methods have a wide range of applications. Classically, transfer-matrix methods are used to count the number of (possibly closed) walks on weighted graphs. However, transfer-matrix methods also appear in seemingly unrelated areas such as optics and to calculate DNA-protein-drug binding in gene regulation ([13]). Maybe less surprising might be its application to the 3-dimensional dimer problem, see ([4]). In [4], the author uses symmetry to reduce the size of the matrix and still keep the biggest eigenvalue the same. We follow these ideas and apply them to our set-up. We end Section 3 with some results on counting the number of orbits, where the Bell number make an appearance.

For fixed n, the problem reduces to the classical graph coloring problem. Graph colorings are ubiquitous in Mathematics and in Computer Science, both from a theoretical and an applied point of view. Historically, graph coloring first arose in work concerning the 4-color conjecture. The 4-color conjecture states that every planar map can be colored with 4 colors so that no two adjacent countries have the same color. This is equivalent to saying that every planar graph can be properly colored using only 4 colors, so that no two adjacent vertices have the same color. It was first proven by Appel and Haken in 1976, see [1] for a monograph. From an applied point of view, graph colorings have applications in, for instance, scheduling problems (see e. g. [8]) and in register allocation in Computer Science (see e. g. [3]). Proper graph colorings also have a close connection to Discrete Geometry and counting integer points in inside-out polytopes, see [2]. Section 4 gives a brief introduction to Ehrhart theory and inside-out polytope and adapts them to our setting. Section 5 combines this geometric approach with transfer-matrix methods to obtain precise results about the number of proper k-colorings of $G \times P_n$ (Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.4), the asymptotic behavior of the number of proper k-colorings of $G \times C_n$ (Theorem 5.10 together with Corollary 5.13.), and a restricted reciprocity result (Theorem 5.8) refining Stanley's reciprocity result for these families of graphs.

The second (and smaller part) follows the same philosophy in a more general setting. We show that Discrete Markov processes also have a transfer-matrix-like behavior. We can hence count the number of Markov chains using these methods (Theorem 6.1). We end this paper with a concrete application to compute the Ehrhart polynomial of a special class of posets (Proposition 6.8 and Corollary 19), which we call *stacked posets*. Though both parts follow the same philosophy, we could not come up with a theorem combining the results from the first and last part.

2 Acknowledgement

The second author was supported by a scholarship of the Berlin Mathematical School. He would like to thank the first author and Aalto University for their hospitality and their support during a month-long research stay.

3 The Transfer-Matrix Method

3.1 Background and Notation

Transfer-matrix methods have a wide range of applications. We want to introduce the general set-up following [11, Section 4.7]. One of the most basic applications is counting the number of walks in a given graph. A *graph* G is a pair $(V, E) = (V(G), E(G))$, where V is the set of *nodes* or *vertices* and E is the set of edges. We assume all our graphs to be finite and we globally set $N := \#V(G)$. A *walk* Γ *of length* n from node u to node v is a sequence $e_1 e_2 \dots e_n$ of edges such that $e_i \cap e_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$, $u \in e_1$, and $v \in e_n$. A walk where $u = v$ is called a *loop*. Let $w\colon E \to \mathbb{C}$ be a weight function. If $\Gamma = e_1 e_2 \dots e_n$ is a walk, then the *weight of* Γ is defined as $w(\Gamma) = w(e_1)w(e_2) \cdot \dots \cdot w(e_n)$. We will now define a matrix $A(n)$ by

$$A_{i,j}(n) := \sum_{\Gamma} w(\Gamma),$$

where the sum ranges over all walks of length n from vertex v_i to vertex v_j. Moreover, we define the matrix A by

$$A_{i,j} := \sum_{e \in E} w(e),$$

where the sum ranges over all edges going from vertex v_i to vertex v_j. $(A)_{i,j}$ is called the *adjacency matrix of* G, but we will sometimes call it the *transfer matrix of* G. The following theorem forms one of the building blocks of the transfer-matrix method:

Theorem 3.1. *[11, Thm. 4.7.1]*
Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then $A^n_{i,j} = A_{i,j}(n)$, where we define $A^0 := I$.

In particular, if $w \equiv 1$, then $A^n_{i,j}$ counts the number of walks from v_i to v_j of length n. Moreover, the number of *closed* walks is counted by powers of the trace. Since the trace is the sum of the eigenvalues, and since the biggest eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}$ is positive by the Frobenius–Perron theorem, the trace is asymptotically dominated by $\lambda^n_{\max}$.

To apply transfer-matrix methods to our problem, we first need two more definitions. A *proper* k*-coloring of a graph* $\Gamma = (V, E)$ is a map $c\colon V \longrightarrow [k]$ such that $c(v) \neq c(u)$ for all u, v with $\{u, v\} \in E$, where we define $[m] := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We refer to the elements of $[k]$ as *colors*. For graphs

$G_1 = (V(G_1), E(G_1))$ and $G_2 = (V(G_2), E(G_2))$ the *Cartesian product* $G_1 \times G_2$ (sometimes in the literature this is also denoted $G_1 \square G_2$) is the graph with vertex set $V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$, and the vertices (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) are connected by an edge if ($u_1 = u_2$ and $\{v_1, v_2\} \in E(G_2)$) or if ($v_1 = v_2$ and $\{u_1, u_2\} \in E(G_1)$). We can think of $G \times P_n$ as n copies of G glued together. Therefore, we will often refer to the copies as $G \times \{1\}$, $G \times \{2\}$, ..., $G \times \{n\}$.



Figure 1: $C_4 \times P_3$ and $P_3 \times P_6$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ be fixed. To count the number of proper colorings of $G \times P_n$, where $V(G) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_p\}$, we associate a new graph M_G to G. The vertices of M_G are labeled by the proper k-colorings of G. Let c_1 and c_2 be proper k-colorings of G. Two vertices $u^1 = (c_1(v_1), c_1(v_2), \ldots, c_1(v_p))$ and $u^2 = (c_2(v_1), c_2(v_2), \ldots, c_2(v_p))$ are connected by an edge if $c_1(v_i) \neq c_2(v_i)$ for all $i \in [p]$. Figure 2 shows M_{P_3} for 3 colors. This construction establishes a connection between k-colorings of $G \times P_n$ ($G \times C_n$) and walks (closed walks) of length n in M_G, respectively. Therefore, we can count the number of k-colorings in $G \times P_n$ using the transfer-matrix method. Moreover, we can asymptotically count the number of colorings of $G \times C_n$, where C_n is the cycle graph on n nodes, by analyzing the biggest eigenvalue of A_{M_G}.

The size of the transfer matrix depends on k, since the number of vertices of M_G depends on k. In this paper, we establish a matrix L whose dimension does *not* depend on k and which can be used to count the number of k colorings of $G \times P_n$ for *all* k. Furthermore, we show that biggest eigenvalue of L equals the biggest eigenvalue of A_{M_G} for all k. We also give a combinatorial and a geometric interpretation for the entries of L.

3.2 Enter Symmetry

In order to establish a matrix L whose dimension does not depend on k, we use that the problem is very symmetric. There are two types of symmetries that appear. Firstly, the problem stays invariant under a permutation of colors. Simply



Figure 2: M_{P_3}

renaming the colors does not change the graph M_G. For example, in Figure 2, the vertex $(1, 2, 1)$ has as many neighbors as the vertex $(3, 2, 3)$. Secondly, the graph G itself also has a symmetry group, called the *automorphism group of* G. We first quotient by the group coming from permuting the colors and then we quotient out by the group of graph symmetries. We apply the following lemma to show that the biggest eigenvalue of A_{M_G} — the transfer matrix of M_G — is the same as the biggest eigenvalue of this newly obtained matrix L.

Lemma 3.2 ([4], Lemma 3.2)**.** *If N is a nonnegative matrix that commutes with a group of permutation matrices G, then the largest eigenvalue of N is the same as the largest eigenvalue of N acting on the subspace of G-invariants.*

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of all colorings of G and let o_1, o_2, $\ldots$, o_p be the orbits under a fixed group action. Moreover, let A_{M_G} be the transfer matrix of the graph M_G. Following the arguments described in [4], we obtain a $p \times p$ matrix L whose entries are given by

$$L_{i,j} = \sum_m a_{i,m},$$

where the sum ranges over all elements in orbit o_j. Therefore, $L_{i,j}$ counts the number of colorings of $G \times P_2$, where the $G \times \{1\}$ is colored by a fixed representative of o_i and the coloring of the $G \times \{2\}$ is in o_j. This leads us to our next definition, where $P_G(k)$ is the *chromatic polynomial* of the graph G.

Definition 3.3. *For any graph G, let O_G be the set of partitions of the vertex set of G into independent sets (or, equivalently, the set of unlabeled colorings of G). For any ordered pair (o_i, o_j) of partitions in O_G, define a graph G_{o_i,o_j} by the following procedure:*

(1) Start with two disjoint copies of G, called G_i and G_j;

(2) For every vertex v of G, make $v_i \in G_i$ and $v_j \in G_j$ adjacent;

(3r) For every independent set I in o_i, identify the vertices of G_i in I;

(3c) For every independent set I in o_j, identify the vertices of G_j in I;

(4r) Add edges between all G_i vertices to make it into a clique;

(4c) Add edges between all G_j vertices to make it into a clique.

Construct the real symmetric matrix $\tilde{A}_G$ whose rows and columns are indexed by O_G, and the (o_i, o_j)–entry is $P_{G_{o_i,o_j}}(k)$.

The G_{o_i,o_j} graphs are essentially two complete graphs with some edges between them. The order of the complete graphs are the same as the number of independent sets in the corresponding partitions. The degree of the (o_i, o_j)–entry of M_G is the order of G_{o_i,o_j}, and that is at most twice the order of G. In fact, there is only one entry of the maximal degree, and that's when both o_i and o_g are the partitions with one vertex in each part.

With this definition, we can give a combinatorial interpretation of entries of L.

Definition 3.4. *For any graph G, define a modified version L_G of the matrix $\tilde{A}_G$ in Definition 3.3, by replacing the (o_i, o_j)–entry $P_{G_{o_i,o_j}}(k)$ with*

$$\frac{P_{G_{o_i,o_j}}(k)}{\#o_i}.$$

We call L_G the compactified transfer matrix *of $G \times P_2$ or sometimes just the* transfer matrix*.*

We want to give a combinatorial interpretation of the entries of L. For this we need the following definition:

Definition 3.5. *Let Γ be a graph and let G be a subgraph of Γ with a fixed proper coloring of G. We say that Γ has an G-*restricted partial coloring *and a coloring of Γ that agrees with the fixed coloring of G is called an G-*restricted coloring *of Γ. The counting function*

$$P_\Gamma(G, k) := \#G\text{-restricted colorings of } \Gamma$$

is called the G-restricted chromatic polynomial *of* Γ*, or if* G *is clear from the context the* restricted chromatic polynomial *of* Γ.

Let $\tilde{H} \in o_i$ be given. Then $\tilde{H}$ induces a partial coloring H of G_{o_i,o_j}. Then

$$L_{o_i,o_j} = \frac{P_{G_{o_i,o_j}}(k)}{\#o_i}$$

is the number of $H-$restricted colorings of G_{o_i,o_j}.

Moreover, Lemma 3.2 implies that the biggest eigenvalue of L and A_G agree.

Corollary 3.6. *The biggest eigenvalue of* L *is the same as the biggest eigenvalue of the original transfer matrix* A_G.

Example 3.7. *We illustrate this procedure in the following example, where* $G = P_3$. *The orbits are* $o_1 = \{\{1,3\},\{2\}\}$ *and* $o_2 = \{\{1\},\{2\},\{3\}\}$*, so we can expect a* 2×2 *matrix* L. *In this matrix, the* (i,j) *-entry counts the number of colorings where the first* P_3 *is colored by a fixed representative of* o_i *and the second* P_3 *is colored by any element in* o_j.

	121	131	141	212	232	242	313	323	343	414	424	434	123	124	132	134	142	143	213	214	231	234	241	243	312	314	321	324	341	342	412	413	421	423	431	432
121	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
131	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
141	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
212	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
232	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
242	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
313	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
323	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
343	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
414	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
424	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
434	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
123	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
124	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
132	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
134	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
142	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
143	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
213	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
214	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
231	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
234	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
241	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
243	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
312	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
314	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
321	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
324	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
341	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
342	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
412	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
413	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
421	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
423	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
431	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
432	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Figure 3: Adjacency matrix of M_G for 4 colors

Figure 3 shows the transfer matrix for four colorings of the three vertex path. We can quotient out the orbits while keeping the maximal eigenvalue, giving the matrix

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 10 \\ 5 & 11 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In L we have recorded the row sums within each orbit/rectangle of the matrix in Figure 3.

Now we do the same calculation but for k colors. For the matrix L the entries will be polynomial for $k \geq 3$, but for lower k the polynomials might not make sense, as for small k there are not enough colors for every orbit. On the other hand, the polynomials are of degree at most three. By explicit computer calculations for $k = 3, 4, 5, 6$ we infer that the matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} k^2 - 3k + 3 & k^3 - 6k^2 + 13k - 10 \\ k^2 - 4k + 5 & k^3 - 6k^2 + 14k - 13 \end{pmatrix}$$

for $k \geq 3$. In comparison, the adjacency matrix of M_G of proper k-colorings of P_3 has dimension $k(k-1)^2 \times k(k-1)^2$.

3.3 Results on Orbit Counting

As we have seen in the previous subsection, we should exploit the symmetry of our problem. However, what we did not address so far is how many orbits we can expect. This subsection only deals with finding the explicit number of orbits after quotienting out by permutations of colors. We identify two colorings c_1 and c_2 if there is a permutation π of colors such that $\pi(c_1) = c_2$. We want to count the number of orbits of G after taking the quotient by permutations of colors.

Let

$$F_k(G) := \#\text{ orbits of } k\text{-colorings of G}$$

be the function that counts the number of orbits. Note that $F_k(G) = F_{k+l}(G)$ if $k \geq |V|$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Therefore, we can define $F(G) := F_k(G)$ for a $k \geq |V|$. We didn't find the following lemma in the literature, but it is quite possibly known.

Lemma 3.8 (Deletion-Contraction for Orbits)**.** *Let $e \in E$ be given and let G/e denote the contraction of G along the edge e. Then*

$$F(G - e) = F(G) + F(G/e). \tag{1}$$

Proof. Let $k \geq |V|$. This proof is analogous to the proof of deletion-contraction for the chromatic polynomial. This proof establishes a bijection b between the sets

$$\overbrace{\{k\text{-colorings of } G - e\}}^{A:=} \overset{b}{\longleftrightarrow} \overbrace{\{k\text{-colorings of } G\}}^{B:=} \sqcup \overbrace{\{k\text{-colorings of } G/e\}}^{C:=}, \tag{2}$$

where clearly $B \cap C = \emptyset$. To prove (1), we need to show that if c_1, $c_2 \in A$ are in the same orbit, then the corresponding colorings c_1', $c_2' \in B \cup C$ are also in the same orbit, and vice versa.

Let u and v be the vertices connected by the edge e and let c_1, $c_2 \in A$ be two colorings in the same orbit. Then there are two cases:

1. If $c_i(u) \neq c_i(v)$ where $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then $b(c_i) \in B$, so the associated coloring is a proper coloring of G. But this also means that $\pi(b(c_1)) = b(c_2)$, since the bijection does not change the coloring.

2. If $c_i(u) = c_i(v)$, then $b(c_i) \in C$, so the associated coloring is a proper coloring of G/e. This again directly implies that $\pi(b(c_1)) = b(c_2)$, since b does not change the coloring of u and v.

The other direction follows analogously.

□

Remark 3.9. *Since we do not use graph symmetry, the following results give a crude upper bound for the dimension of the matrix.*

Since we can now use deletion-contraction to count the number of orbits, we can successively remove all edges. This means that the number of orbits of graphs without edges forms the building block of all orbits.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $G_n = ([n], \emptyset)$ be the graph on n nodes without edges. Then*

$$F(G_n) = \mathcal{B}_n, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_n$ is the n^{th} Bell number.

Proof. Since we do not take graph symmetries into account, a coloring of a graph without edges corresponds to a partition of a set with n *labeled* elements, and every such set partition corresponds to a coloring. These set partitions are counted by the Bell numbers. □

We want to finish this section by giving some small applications of deletion-contraction to count the number of orbits of path graphs and cycle graphs.

Lemma 3.11. *Let P_n be the path graph on n nodes. The number of orbits $F(P_n)$ is*

$$F(P_n) = \mathcal{B}_{n-1}. \tag{4}$$

Proof. This follows from the special case $k = 1$ from Theorem 2, [14]. □

As a corollary, we obtain the following relation (which can be rewritten as an honest recursion) that we also didn't find in the literature.

Corollary 3.12. *The Bell numbers satisfy the relation*

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \binom{n}{i-1} (-1)^{n+1-i} \mathcal{B}_i. \tag{5}$$

Proof. Use (1) repeatedly on P_n and induct on n. □

Corollary 3.13. *Let C_n denote the cycle graph on n nodes. Then*

$$F(C_n) = \mathcal{B}_{n-1} - \mathcal{B}_{n-2} + \cdots + (-1)^n \mathcal{B}_1 \tag{6}$$

Proof. Apply (1) to C_n and induct on n. □

Remark 3.14. *Deletion-contraction does* not *work if we mod out by graph symmetries, as the bijection does no longer hold. On the right-hand side of (2), we have removed an edge or identified two nodes, which changes the automorphism group. However, one should in principle be able to determine the number of orbits using Burnside's lemma.*

4 Ehrhart Theory and Inside-Out Polytopes

Chromatic polynomials are ubiquitous in Graph Theory and Combinatorics. They also have a beautiful geometric interpretation. In this section, we will explain the geometric setup that will later help us understand the transfer matrix L. This section is based on results from [2].

The fundamental geometric objects are polytopes. A *(convex) polytope* P is the convex hull of finitely many points. If the dimension of the affine hull of P is d, we call P a d-polytope. Polytopes form an interesting subject in itself, and we refer the interested reader to [15]. For positive integers t, one can define the counting function

$$E_P(t) := \#\left(tP \cap \mathbb{Z}^d\right),$$

which is called the *Ehrhart function* of P. Ehrhart famously proved that this function is a quasipolynomial if the vertices of P are rational and it is even a polynomial if the vertices are integer points, see [5]. The following result was conjectured by Ehrhart, but first proven in full generality by Macdonald, see [7].

Theorem 4.1 (Ehrhart-Macdonald reciprocity)**.** *Let P be a d-dimensional rational polytope. Then*

$$E_P(-t) = (-1)^d E_{P^\circ}(t), \tag{7}$$

where $E_{P^\circ}(t)$ counts the number of integer points in the interior of tP.

Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a closed, convex d-polytope and let $\mathcal{H}$ be an arrangement of *rational* hyperplanes that meets P transversally, i. e., every flat

$$u \in \left\{ \bigcap S \colon\ S \subset \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \bigcap S \neq \emptyset \right\}$$

that intersects the topological closure of P also intersects the interior P°. Following the notation and definitions of [2], we call $(P, \mathcal{H})$ a *rational inside-out polytope*. For positive integers t, the authors define the *open Ehrhart quasipolynomial*

$$E^\circ_{P,\mathcal{H}}(t) := \#\left(\mathbb{Z}^d \cap t\left[P \setminus \bigcup H\right]\right).$$

Since we assume P to be full-dimensional, the hyperplane arrangement subdivides P into closed regions R_1, R_2, ..., R_m. Moreover, we can define

$$E_{P,\mathcal{H}}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} E_{R_i}(t) \qquad \text{and} \qquad E^{\circ}_{P^{\circ},\mathcal{H}}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} E_{R_i^{\circ}}(t),$$

where $E_{R_i}(t)$ is the classical Ehrhart quasipolynomial of the closed region R_i, see [2, (4.2)]. Here is an adaption of [2, Theorem 4.1] to our setting:

Theorem 4.2. *If $(P, \mathcal{H})$ is a d-dimensional lattice inside-out polytope, then $E_{P,\mathcal{H}}(t)$ and $E^{\circ}_{P^{\circ},\mathcal{H}}(t)$ are polynomials of degree d and they also satisfy the reciprocity theorem*

$$E^{\circ}_{P^{\circ},\mathcal{H}}(t) = (-1)^d E_{P,\mathcal{H}}(-t). \tag{8}$$

Since we will work with orbits, and we thus intersect the inside-out polytope with hyperplanes, we also need the following abbreviated version of [2, Corollary 4.3]:

Corollary 4.3. *Let D be a discrete lattice in $\mathbb{R}^d$, P a D-fractional convex polytope, i. e., all vertices of P lie in $t^{-1}D$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, and $\mathcal{H}$ a hyperplane arrangement in $s := \operatorname{aff}(P)$ that does not contain the degenerate hyperplane. Then $E_{P,\mathcal{H}}(t)$ and $E^{\circ}_{P^{\circ},\mathcal{H}}(t)$ are quasipolynomials in t that satisfy the reciprocity law*

$$E^{\circ}_{P^{\circ},\mathcal{H}}(t) = (-1)^{\dim s} E_{P,\mathcal{H}}(-t).$$

The next result connects inside-out polytopes with proper colorings of graphs, see [2, Theorem 5.1]:

Theorem 4.4. *Let Γ be an ordinary graph on n vertices and let $P = [0,1]^n$. Moreover, we define*

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma) := \{x_i = x_j : \text{for all edges } \{x_i, x_j\} \in E\}.$$

Then

$$E^{\circ}_{P^{\circ},\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)}(t) = (-1)^n E_{P,\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)}(-t) = P_{\Gamma}(t-1). \tag{9}$$

Remark 4.5. *The intuition behind this theorem is the following: Every integer point in the interior of P corresponds to a (not necessarily proper) coloring of Γ. If Γ contains the edge $\{x_i, x_j\}$, then any proper coloring cannot have an integer point on the hyperplane $x_i = x_j$. Therefore, every integer point in $(P^{\circ}, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$ corresponds to a proper coloring of Γ and vice versa.*

One immediate consequence of this is that P_{Γ} is a polynomial of degree n and the leading coefficient is 1 as the sum of the volumes of the inside-out polytopes equals 1.

We can use this setup to find a geometric interpretation of proper colorings that lie in a given orbit o. As described above, every orbit can be described by



Figure 4: Integer points in dashed triangles correspond to proper k-colorings of P_2.

a partition of the vertex set V into independent sets. For every independent set $I \in o$, we get an additional hyperplane arrangement

$$\mathcal{H}_I := \{x_i = x_j \colon \text{for all } i,\, j \in I\}\,.$$

Moreover, we also get forbidden hyperplanes from requiring that elements in different independent sets have different colors. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_{o,I} := \{x_i = x_j \colon \text{for all } \{i,j\} \text{ s.t } i \in I \text{ and } j \notin I\}\,.$$

Together with the previous results, this now shows:

Theorem 4.6. *Let Γ be an ordinary graph on n vertices and let o be an orbit of the graph. Moreover let*

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma, o) := \{x_i = x_j \colon \{x_i, x_j\} \in E(\Gamma)\} \cup \bigcup_I H_{o,I}$$

and

$$P_o := [0,1]^n \cap \left(\bigcap_I \mathcal{H}_I\right)$$

Then we have

$$(-1)^s E_{P_o,\mathcal{H}(\Gamma,o)}(-t) = E^\circ_{\mathrm{relint}(P_o),\mathcal{H}(\Gamma,o)}(t) = P_{\Gamma,o}(t-1),$$

where s is the number of colors used in orbit o.

We now want to apply this geometric setting to the transfer-matrix theory to interpret the entries of L in terms of Ehrhart polynomials. Recall that we want to color $\Gamma := G \times P_2$, where G is a graph on N nodes. In the classical setting, we have a subdivision of the $2N$-cube stemming from the edges of the graph Γ. However, we want to further refine this subdivision according to the orbit structure. As we will see, this subdivision nicely resembles the symmetry of the orbits.

Let $o_i, o_j \in O_G$, let G be a graph with N vertices, and let $V(P_2) = \{1, 2\}$. Pick a representative of o_i and color the first N vertices accordingly. This defines an $(G \times \{1\})$-restricted coloring of $G \times P_2$, which we will call an o_i-restricted coloring. Recall that L_{o_i,o_j} counts the number of o_i-restricted colorings such that the coloring of $G \times \{2\}$ lies on o_j. Fixing a representative in o_i means corresponds to an intersection of the inside-out polytope coming from Γ with the hyperplanes $x_1 = c_1$, $x_2 = c_2$, ..., and $x_N = c_N$, where $c \in o_i$.

Requiring that the coloring of $G \times \{2\}$ lies on o_j means we further intersect the inside-out polytope with $\mathcal{H}_I$ for every independent set $I \in o_j$ and add $\mathcal{H}_{o_j,I}$ to hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{H}$.

There are facts that directly follow from this geometric setup:

1. Every entry $L_{o_i o_j}$ counts the number of integer points in a lattice inside-out polytope of dimension #colors of o_j.
2. $\#o_j \cdot L_{o_i o_j} = P_{G_{o_i,o_j}}$
3. and this construction resembles the symmetry of the orbit o_i; no matter what representative we pick — read: no matter what hyperplanes of the same type we choose — we always have the same number of integer points.

5 The Transfer-Matrix Method and Ehrhart Theory Combined

In this section, we want to explain how Ehrhart theory appears in the transfer-matrix method and how we can use the discrete geometric setup to find an interpretation for reciprocity for the row sums of L^n. Moreover, we will use the geometry to find a Ehrhart-theoretic interpretation for the entries of L^n. Lastly, we will use classical graph theory to find an upper and lower bound for the biggest eigenvalue of L and thus also for the adjacency matrix of the transfer-matrix graph.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a group acting on the colorings of the graph G and let o_1, o_2, ..., o_p be the different orbits under this group action. Then $L = (L_{i,j}(k))$ will be a $p \times p$ matrix and recall that the entry (i, j) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L_{i,j} &= \#o_i\text{-restricted colorings of } G \times P_2 \text{ s. t. } 2^{\text{nd}}G \text{ lies in } o_j \\ &= \frac{P_{G_{o_i,o_j}}(k)}{\#o_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The next result shows that L behaves like a transfer matrix.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $V(P_{n+1}) = \{1, 2, \ldots, n+1\}$ and let $c \in o_i$ be a fixed coloring of G in o_i. The (i, j)-entry of L^n counts the number of colorings of $G \times P_{n+1}$, where $G \times \{1\}$ is colored by c, $G \times \{n+1\}$ is colored by an arbitrary element of orbit o_j, and where $k \geq$ #colors used in o_i.*

Proof. We induct on n and let $V(P_n) = \{1, 2 \ldots, n\}$. By construction, the statement is true for $n = 1$, so let the statement be true for all $m \leq n-1$. We denote the $(i,j)-$entry of $L^m \in \mathbb{Z}^{p \times p}$ by $L^m_{i,j}$. Then

$$L^n_{i,j} = (L^{n-1}L)_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{p} L^{n-1}_{i,k} L_{k,j}.$$

By induction hypothesis, the entry $L^{n-1}_{i,k}$ counts the number of colorings where the the coloring of $G \times \{1\}$ is fixed by a representative in o_i and the coloring of $G \times \{n\}$ lies in orbit o_k. Moreover, $L_{k,j}$ counts the colorings where the first G is fixed by a representative in o_k and the coloring of the second G lies in o_j. Therefore, $L^{n-1}_{i,k} L_{k,j}$ counts the colorings where the coloring of $G \times \{1\}$ is fixed by a representative of o_i, the coloring of $G \times \{n\}$ lies in o_k, and the coloring of $G \times \{n+1\}$ lies in o_j. The sum is taken over all possible orbits and the claim follows. □

Remark 5.2. *This shows that the entries of L^n can be interpreted as Ehrhart polynomials of inside-out polytopes.*

Example 5.3 (Example 3.7 continued)**.** *Let $G = P_3$ with the orbits $o_1 = \{\{1,3\},\{2\}\}$ and $o_2 = \{\{1\},\{2\},\{3\}\}$. Recall that*

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} k^2 - 3k + 3 & k^3 - 6k^2 + 13k - 10 \\ k^2 - 4k + 5 & k^3 - 6k^2 + 14k - 13 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $(L^5)_{1,1}$ counts the number of colorings of $G \times P_6$,



Figure 5: $G \times P_6$

where the two black dots indicate that the two corresponding nodes need to be colored by the same color.

Moreover, this enables us to directly compute the chromatic polynomial of $G \times P_{n+1}$ from L^n.

Corollary 5.4. *Let $G \times P_{n+1}$ and L be as above. Then*

$$P_{G \times P_{n+1}}(k) = (w_1(k), \ldots, w_p(k)) L^n \mathbf{1}, \tag{10}$$

where $w_i(k)$ is the size of o_i and $\mathbf{1} := (1, \ldots, 1)^t$.

Proof. Let $V(P_n) = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. The i^{th} entry L_i of $L^n\mathbf{1}$ counts the number of colorings where $G \times \{1\}$ is colored by a representative of o_i. By symmetry, the total number of colorings with the coloring of $G \times \{1\}$ being in o_i equals

$$w_i(k)L_i.$$

Now $(w_1(k), \ldots, w_p(k))L^n\mathbf{1}$ sums over all possible orbits and the claim now directly follows. □

Remark 5.5. *Even though the definition of L implicitly assumes that the number of colors $k \geq \#V(G)$, the corollary makes sense* for all k. *If $k \leq \#V(G)$, then the weights of the orbits using more than k colors are* 0.

Example 5.6 (Example 3.7 continued)**.** *The chromatic polynomial of $P_3 \times P_6$ is*

$$\chi(k) = (w_1, w_2) \begin{pmatrix} k^2 - 3k + 3 & k^3 - 6k^2 + 13k - 10 \\ k^2 - 4k + 5 & k^3 - 6k^2 + 14k - 13 \end{pmatrix}^{6-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $w_1 = k(k-1)$ and $w_2 = k(k-1)(k-2)$.



Figure 6: $P_3 \times P_6$

Stanley, see [11], famously showed that chromatic polynomials satisfy a reciprocity theorem. Given an acyclic orientation α of Γ and given a not necessarily proper k-coloring x, we say that (α, x) are compatible if $x_j \geq x_i$, whenever the orientation of the edge $\{i, j\}$ is (i, j). We give Beck's and Zaslavsky's reformulation of [10, Theorem 1.2]

Proposition 5.7. *[2, Cor. 5.5] The number of pairs (α, x) consisting of an acyclic orientation of an ordinary graph Γ and a compatible k-coloring equals $(-1)^n P_\Gamma(-k)$. In particular, $(-1)^n P_\Gamma(-1)$ equals the number of acyclic orientations of Γ.*

One immediate question is if there is a similar result for L. The next theorem gives an answer in terms of restricted colorings.

Theorem 5.8. *Let $L \in \mathbb{Z}^{p \times p}$ be as above, let $L_i^n := \sum_{k=1}^p L_{i,k}^n$ be the i^{th} row sum of L^n, and let $V(P_{n+1}) = \{1, 2, \ldots, n+1\}$. Then for $k \geq N = \#V(G)$*

$$L_i^n(-k) = (-1)^N \#(\alpha, c) \text{ of } G \times P_{n+1} \text{ where } G \times \{1\} \text{ is colored by rep. of } o_i, \tag{11}$$

where (α, c) is a pair of an acyclic orientation α and a compatible o_i-restricted k-coloring c.

Proof. By Corollary 4.3 and by Theorem 5.1, we know that $L_i^n(-k)$ counts the number of integer points in the closure of the inside-out polytope intersected with the hyperplanes coming from o_i. Geometrically, this means

$$L_i^n(k) = E^{\circ}_{P^{\circ}_{o_i},\mathcal{H}(G\times P_{n+1})}(k+1),$$

where $P_{o_i} := [0,1]^{nN} \cap \{x_l = c_l \colon\ l \in [N]\}$ for a representative $(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_N) \in o_i$. Therefore, for $k \geq \max_{l\in[N]}\{c_l\} - 1$ we have that

$$L^n(-(k+1)) = (-1)^{N(n-1)} E_{P_{o_i},\mathcal{H}(G\times P_{n+1})}(k).$$

Similar to [2, Proof of Cor. 5.5] one can now observe that the right-hand side counts the number of compatible pairs (α, c), where c is a —not necessarily proper— o_i-restricted $k+1$-coloring and α is an acyclic orientation. Here we implicitly used that $k \geq \max_{l\in[N]}\{c_l\}-1$, as otherwise the corresponding region might be empty. □

Corollary 5.9. *Let $k \geq N$ Then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} L_{i,j}(-k) = \#(\alpha, c) \text{ where first } G \text{ is fixed by a representative of } o_i, \quad (12)$$

where (α, c) is a pair of an acyclic orientation and compatible k-coloring.

Figure 7 illustrates the result for $P_3 \times P_2$, where $k = 3$. The orientation of the dashed edges can be chosen arbitrarily. The red number gives the multiplicity of the given case.

If one is however interested in the asymptotic behavior of graphs $G \times C_n$, then we need to find good bounds for the biggest eigenvalue of L, as this dominates the asymptotics. The next theorem gives an upper and a lower bound and in particular it shows that the eigenvalue grows like a polynomial of degree $\#V(G)$.

Theorem 5.10. *Let $\lambda_{\max}$ be the biggest eigenvalue of L (and thus of the adjacency matrix A_{M_G}). Then*

$$\delta(L) \leq \lambda_{\max} \leq \Delta(L), \quad (13)$$

where $\delta(L)$ and $\Delta(L)$ are the smallest and biggest row sum of L, respectively.

Proof. It's a well known result that the biggest eigenvalue of an adjacency matrix is bounded above and below by the biggest and smallest degree of the graph, respectively. These are exactly the biggest and smallest row sums of L. □

Now the question of determining the biggest eigenvalue reduces to determining those polynomials. This might be a computationally challenging. Our next result gives a combinatorial interpretation of the two highest coefficients, which gives us a quick way to obtain the two highest coefficients without computing L. Before we state the result, we first need another definition.



Figure 7: All $(1,2,3)$-restricted, compatible pairs of acyclic orientations and (not necessary proper) colorings of $P_3 \times P_2$.

Definition 5.11. *Let G be a graph and let H be a subgraph of G with a fixed proper coloring. The vertices in $V(G) \setminus V(H)$ are called* free vertices *and the edges containing a free vertex are called* free edges *of G.*

Lemma 5.12. *Let H be a subgraph of G and let $N := \#V(G)$ and $M := \#V(H)$. The H-restricted chromatic polynomial of a graph G is a polynomial of degree $N - M$ with leading coefficient 1 and with second highest coefficient $-\#$ free edges, where we assume that $k \geq N$.*

Proof. Every H-restricted coloring can be associated with a coloring of $G \setminus H$, where we additionally have *local rules* coming from edges $\{u, v\}$ where without loss of generality $u \in V(G)$ and $v \in V(H)$. The local rules state that any vertex in $G \setminus H$ cannot be colored using a color from one of its adjacent neighbors in H.

Geometrically, the inside-out polytope corresponding to G is N-dimensional. Coloring H corresponds to intersecting the inside-out polytope with the additional M hyperplanes, so we get an $N-M =: n$-dimensional inside-out polytope with the additional hyperplanes coming from the local rules. Therefore, the leading coefficient is still 1 and we can count the number of restricted k-colorings of G by an inclusion-exclusion argument

$$k^n - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}(E(G)\setminus E(H)) \cup \mathcal{L}} \mathrm{E}_{[0,1]^n \cap H}(k-1) + \overbrace{\cdots}^{\text{lower dimensional terms}},$$

where $\mathcal{L} := \{x_u \neq c_v \colon \text{for } u \in V(G) \setminus V(H) \text{ and } v \in V(H)\}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{[0,1]^n \cap H}(k -$

1) = k^{n-1} for all H. The number of summands is exactly the number of free edges, which proves the claim. □

This implies:

Corollary 5.13. *Let o_p be the orbit using $N = \#V(G)$ colors. Then we have that $\delta(L)$ and $\Delta(L)$ are polynomials of degree N, their leading coefficient is $a_N = 1$, and*

$$a_{N-1} = -\#\textit{free edges of } G_{o_p,o_p} + \#\textit{orbits using } N-1 \textit{ colors.}$$

In particular, the highest two terms of both polynomials agree.

Proof. Let o_i be an arbitrary orbit, then the row sum L_{o_i} indexed by o_i counts all o_i-restricted colorings of $G \times P_2$. Geometrically, we have a $2N$-dimensional inside-out polytope and we intersect the inside-out polytope with the hyperplanes $x_1 = c_1, \ldots, x_N = c_N$, where $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_N) \in o_i$. It is straightforward to check that entry (o_i, o_j) counts integer points in an s_j-dimensional k^{th}-dilate of an inside-out polytope, where s_j is the number of different colors used in o_j. In particular, every entry is a polynomial of degree s_j. Therefore, the row sum counts integer points in the k^{th}-dilation of at most N-dimensional lattice polytopes. There is only one entry of degree N, namely (o_i, o_p). The volume of the inside-out polytope corresponding to (o_i, o_p) is 1, which is straightforward to verify. This shows that the row sum is given by a polynomial of degree N with leading coefficient $a_N = 1$.

There are two different contributions to a_{N-1}. The only entries that contribute to the second highest term are the ones using exactly $N-1$ colors and the unique entry (o_i, o_p). By Proposition 5.12, this entry gives us a contribution of $-\#$free edges of G_{o_i,o_p}. Every other contribution comes from orbits using $N-1$ colors and every such orbit contributes a 1, as the volume of the corresponding inside-out polytopes is again 1. This proves the claim. □

To summarize, we get:

Proposition 5.14. *Let G be a graph and $N = \#V(G)$ and let $\delta(L)$ and $\Delta(L)$ be as above. Then the doubly asymptotic behavior of the number of proper k-colorings of $G \times C_n$ is dominated by $\lambda_{\max}$ and we have*

$$\delta(L) \leq \lambda_{\max} \leq \Delta(L),$$

where $\delta(L) = \sum_{i=0}^{N} a_i k^i$ and $\Delta(L) = \sum_{i=0}^{N} b_i k^i$ and $a_N = b_N$ and $a_{N-1} = b_{N-1}$.

6 Counting Discrete Markov Processes

6.1 The General Setup

In this section, we want to show how we can use a similar approach to obtain results about counting discrete Markov chains. We will first formulate the result in a general form before we apply it to order polytopes of *stacked posets*.

For us, a *discrete Markov chain* is a discrete-time stochastic process with random variables $\{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m\}$, where the random variables take values in a discrete set of states $\mathcal{S}$. Moreover, we require that a transition from state s^i to state s^j only depends on state s^i and not on any previous states. A *base state* is a labeling $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ of m nodes by elements from $[m]$ with $\min_{i\in[m]}\{b_i\} = 1$. A *state* is an element in the equivalence class $b + \mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1} := (1, \ldots, 1)^t$. A *move* f is a vector $f \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ and we say that f is a move from state s^i to s^j if $r^i + f \in s^j$, where $r^i \in s^i$ and we denote it by $s^i \xrightarrow{f} s^j$. We assume that $|f_i| \leq m$ for all $i \in [m]$. Now let $\mathcal{S} = \left\{s^1, s^2, \ldots, s^r\right\}$ be a finite set of states with corresponding base states $\left\{b^1, b^2, \ldots, b^r\right\}$ and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a finite set of moves. We define $M \in R^{r\times r}$ to be

$$M_{i,j} := M_{i,j}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_r) \sum_{f\in\mathcal{F}:\ s^i\xrightarrow{f}s^j} x^f := \sum_{f\in\mathcal{F}:\ s^i\xrightarrow{f}s^j} x_1^{f_1}\ldots x_r^{f_r},$$

where $R := \mathbb{Z}[\![x_1^{\pm 1}, x_2^{\pm 1}, \ldots, x_r^{\pm 1}]\!]$ and we call M the *transition matrix*.

Similar to Theorem 5.1, $M^n_{i,j}$ records all chains of length $n+1$ with starting state s^i and ending state s^j. Therefore, M^n records all information on $n+1$ chains, and we thus get the following Proposition:

Theorem 6.1. *With the previous notation, we have:*

- *the number of chains of length $n+1$ is given by*

$$\#\textit{number of chains of length } n{+}1 = \mathbf{1}^t M^n \big|_{x=(1,1,\ldots,1)}\ \mathbf{1}, \tag{14}$$

- *the number I_k of chains so that no element is increased by more than k is given by*

$$I_k = \left(\deg_{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_r\leq k}(x^{b^1}, \ldots, x^{b^n})M^n\right)\big|_{x=(1,1,\ldots,1)}\ \mathbf{1}, \tag{15}$$

  where no indeterminate x_i can have a bigger degree than k.

6.2 Application to Order Polytopes

Order polytopes have been famously introduced by Stanley, see [12]. In this subsection, we want to apply the previous proposition to a certain class or order polytopes. A *partially ordered set* —or *poset* for short— Π is a set together with a binary relation $\leq_\Pi$ that is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive, and $\leq_\Pi$ is called a *partial order on* Π. All our posets will be *finite*. To every poset P, one can associate the order polytope $\mathcal{O}(P)$:

Definition 6.2 ([12], Def. 1.1)**.** *The order polytope $\mathcal{O}(P)$ of the poset P is the subset of $\mathbb{R}^P$ defined by the conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq f(x) \leq 1 && \textit{for all } x \in P\\ &f(x) \leq f(y) && \textit{if } x \leq y \textit{ in } P \end{aligned}$$

Order polytopes are closely related to order-preserving maps, whose definition we now recall.

Definition 6.3. *A map $\pi\colon P \longrightarrow Q$ between two posets P and Q is called* order-preserving *if $\pi(x) \leq_Q \pi(y)$ for all $x \leq_P y$.*

To apply the machinery from the previous subsection to order polytopes, we first need to define stacked posets, define what the states are, and lastly define the set of moves.

Definition 6.4. *Let Π be a graded poset of rank 2 satisfying*

$$\#\{x \in \Pi\colon \deg x = 1\} = \#\{x \in \Pi\colon \deg x = 2\}.$$

We can therefore label the elements of Π by $\{(1,1),\dots,(1,l),(2,1),\dots,(2,l)\}$, and we assume that $(1,k) \leq_\Pi (2,k)$ for all k. We can then define the stacked poset Π_n of height $n+1$ *having the elements $\{(i,j)\colon i \in [n+1], j \in [l]\}$ and cover relations*

$$(i+1,p) \succcurlyeq_{\Pi_n} (i,q) \text{ if and only if } (2,p) \succcurlyeq_\Pi (1,q). \tag{16}$$

This directly implies

$$\#\{x \in \Pi_n\colon \deg x = 1\} = \cdots = \#\{x \in \Pi_n\colon \deg x = n+1\}. \tag{17}$$

The subposet $\Pi := \{x \in \Pi_n\colon \deg x \in \{1,2\}\}$ is called the base poset.

Since Π_n is completely determined by Π, we will normally only give the definition of Π.

Example 6.5. *The poset $\Pi = \{a,b,c,d,e,f\}$ with the relations $a \leq_\Pi c,d$; $b \leq_\Pi c,d$; $c \leq_\Pi e,f$; and $d \leq_\Pi e,f$ is a 2-stacked poset and with base poset $B = \{a,b,c,d\}$.*



Figure 8: Two stacked posets, Π from the example is on the left.

Next, we define the (base) states and moves of a stacked poset.

Definition 6.6. *A* base state b *of a stacked poset is given by a labeling of all elements of same degree by numbers from* $1, 2, \ldots, m$ *such that if* j *appears in this labeling, then all* $1, 2, \ldots, j-1$ *appear too, where* $m = \#\{x\colon \deg x = 1\}$. *We identify this base state with the vector* $b \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}^m$. *A* move from state s^i to s^j *is adding the vector* $f \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, m\}^m$ *to* b^i *such that*

1. b^i *and* $b^i + f$ *contain all numbers from* 1 *to* $\max_{1\leq k\leq m}(b^i + f)_k$,
2. $b^i + f \in s^j$,
3. *and if we label the degree* a *elements of* Π *by* b^i *and the degree* $a + 1$ *elements by* $b^i + f$, *we get an order-preserving labeling.*

The set of moves $\mathcal{F}$ *contains all possible moves.*

As we will see, this definition enables us to determine the number of surjective, order-preserving maps of Π_n into $[k]$.



Figure 9: A list of all transitions

Example 6.7. *Let* $\Pi = \{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$ *with the relations* $a \leq_\Pi c, d$; $b \leq_\Pi d$. *The base states of* Π_n *are* $(1, 1)$, $(1, 2)$, *and* $(2, 1)$. *The set of moves contains the elements* $(0, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, $(1, 0)$ $(1, 1)$, $(1, 2)$, $(2, 1)$, $(2, 2)$, $(1, 3)$, *and* $(3, 1)$. *Therefore, we get the transition matrix*

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + xy & x + xy^2 & x + x^2y \\ x + x^2y & 1 + xy + x^2y^2 & x^2 + x^3y \\ y + xy^2 & y^2 + xy^3 & xy + x^2y^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proposition 6.8. *Let Π_n be a stacked poset. The number of surjective, order-preserving maps from Π_n into $[k]$ is given by*

$$\#\{\pi\colon \Pi_n \twoheadrightarrow [k]\colon \textit{order-pres.}\} = \left(\mathrm{tdeg}_{=k}(x^{b^1},\ldots,x^{b^r})M^n\right)\big|_{x=(1,1,\ldots,1)},\ \mathbf{1} \tag{18}$$

where $x=(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ and where $\mathrm{tdeg}_{=k}$ denotes the terms whose total degree equals k.

Proof. The set of moves $\mathcal{F}$ was defined so that we get an order-preserving map (condition (3)) and that the map is surjective (condition (1)). Therefore,

$$(x^{b^1},\ldots,x^{b^r})M^n\mathbf{1}$$

contains all possible surjective, order-preserving maps. The terms of total degree k correspond to all surjective, order-preserving maps into $[k]$. □

Corollary 6.9. *Let Π_n be an n-stacked poset with base poset Π and transition matrix M, then*

$$\mathrm{Ehr}_{\mathcal{O}(\Pi_n)}(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1}\binom{k+1}{i}\left(\mathrm{tdeg}_{=i}](x^{b^1},\ldots,x^{b^r})M^n\right)\big|_{x=(1,1,\ldots,1)}\ \mathbf{1}, \tag{19}$$

where $x=(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$.

Proof. The Ehrhart polynomial $\mathrm{Ehr}_{\mathcal{O}(\Pi_n)}(k)$ counts the number of order-preserving maps $\pi\colon \Pi_n \longrightarrow [k+1]$. However, we can see that

$$\{\pi\colon \Pi_n \longrightarrow [k+1]\colon \text{order-pres.}\} = \bigsqcup_{n=1}^{k+1}\{\pi\colon \Pi_n \twoheadrightarrow I\colon \text{ord-pres. } I\subset[k+1], \#I=n\}$$

The claim now follows using Proposition 6.8. □

Example 6.10. *Let Π_n be a chain of length n. Then Π_n is a stacked poset, and $\mathcal{O}(\Pi_n)$ is unimodularly equivalent to the standard n-simplex. Thus, we have*

$$\mathrm{Ehr}_{\mathcal{O}(\Pi_n)} = \binom{n+k}{k}.$$

On the other hand, applying Corollary 6.9, we obtain the identity

$$\mathrm{Ehr}_{\mathcal{O}(\Pi_n)} = \binom{n+k}{k} = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1}\binom{k+1}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1}.$$

We want to finish this section by stating explicit formulas for the entry $M_{i,j}$ where i and j correspond to the states s^i and s^j, respectively. Let $S_{<_a}$ be the set of elements that are covered by an element a in the given poset.

Proposition 6.11. *The entry (i,j) of the transition matrix M is given by*

$$M_{i,j} = \sum_{\mu=0}^{\mu_{\max}} x_1^{a_1-b_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_m^{a_m-b_m} \cdot (x_1 \cdot \dots \cdot x_m)^{\lambda+\mu},$$

where

- *$a = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ is the base state of s^j and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$ is the base state of s^i,*
- *$\lambda = -\min\left(\{a_1 - b_p \colon p \in S_{<a_1}\} \cup \dots \cup \{a_m - b_p \colon p \in S_{<a_m}\}\right)$,*
- *and $\mu_{\max} = m - \max\{a_1, \dots, a_m\} - \lambda + \max\{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$.*

Proof. Let us first start by determining the entry $(1,i)$ where 1 corresponds to the state $(1, \dots, 1)$. We assume that $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ is chosen so that $\min\{a_i\} = 1$. The number of new colors introduced by a is exactly

$$\max\{a_1, \dots, a_m\} - \max\{1, \dots, 1\} = \max\{a_1, \dots, a_m\} - 1.$$

The corresponding monomial is $x^{a_1-1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_m^{a_m-1}$. Moreover, every other monomial that can appear in the sum is of the form

$$x^{a_1-1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_m^{a_m-1} \cdot (x_1 \cdot \dots \cdot x_m)^{\mu}$$

for some $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We can introduce up to m new colors while staying surjective, i. e., that the labeling uses all colors from 1 to the highest used color. Therefore, we get that

$$M_{1,i} = \sum_{\mu=0}^{m-\max\{a_1,\dots,a_m\}+1} x_1^{a_1-1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_m^{a_m-1} \cdot (x_1 \cdot \dots \cdot x_m)^{\mu}.$$

Now we need to adjust this setting to an arbitrary base state s^i corresponding to a vector $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ where $\min\{b_i\} = 1$. First of all, it might mean that the target space is represented by a different vector $\tilde{a} = a + (\lambda, \dots, \lambda)$. We want that

$$\min\left(\left\{\tilde{a}_1 - b \colon b \in S_{<\tilde{a}_1}\right\} \cup \left\{\tilde{a}_m - b \colon b \in S_{<\tilde{a}_m}\right\}\right) = 0.$$

However, this is equivalent to

$$\lambda = -\min\left(\{a_1 - b \colon b \in S_{<a_1}\} \cup \dots \cup \{a_m - b \colon b \in S_{<a_m}\}\right).$$

This also gives the (by degree) smallest transition monomial, so we only need to figure out how many summands there are. This corresponds to the question of how many colors we introduce from $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ to $(\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_m)$. However, the number of colors introduced is

$$\max\{\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\} - \max\{b_1, \dots, b_m\},$$

which implies that the highest monomial appearing is

$$x_1^{\tilde{a}_1-b_1}\cdot\ldots x_m^{\tilde{a}_m-b_m}\cdot(x_1\cdot\cdots\cdot x_m)^{\mu_{\max}}=x_1^{a_1-b_1}\cdot\ldots x_m^{a_m-b_m}\cdot(x_1\cdot\cdots\cdot x_m)^{\mu_{\max}+\lambda},$$

where

$$\mu_{\max}=m-\max\{a_1,\ldots,a_m\}-\lambda+\max\{b_1,\ldots,b_m\}.$$

□

References

[1] Appel, Kenneth and Haken, Wolfgang. Every planar map is four colorable. Contemporary Mathematics, 98. *American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI,* 1989. xvi+741 pp.

[2] Beck, Matthias and Zaslavsky, Thomas. Inside-out polytopes. *Adv. Math.* **205** (2006), no. 1, 134–162.

[3] Chaitin, Gregory J. Register allocation & spilling via graph coloring, *Proceeding SIGPLAN '82 Proceedings of the 1982 SIGPLAN symposium on Compiler construction*, pp. 98-105

[4] Ciucu, Mihai. An improved upper bound for the 3-dimensional dimer problem. *Duke Math. J.* **94** (1998), no. 1, 1–11.

[5] Ehrhart, Eugène. Sur les polyèdres rationnels homothétiques à n dimensions, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **254** (1962), 616–618.

[6] Hibi, Takayuki and Higashitani, Akihiro. Smooth Fano polytopes arising from finite partially ordered sets. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **45** (2011), no. 3, 449–461.

[7] Macdonald, Ian G. Polynomials associated with finite cell-complexes, *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, **4** (1971), 181–192.

[8] Marx, Dániel. Graph colouring problems and their applications in scheduling. *Periodica Polytechnica, Electrical Engineering* **48** (2004), no. 1, 11–16.

[9] Ohsugi, Hidefumi and Hibi, Takayuki. Convex polytopes all of whose reverse lexicographic initial ideals are squarefree. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **129** (2001), no. 9, 2541–2546.

[10] Stanley, Richard P. Acyclic orientations of graphs. *Discrete Math.* **5** (1973), 171–178.

[11] Stanley, Richard P. Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 1. Second edition. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 49. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 2012. xiv+626 pp.

[12] Stanley, Richard P. Two poset polytopes. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **1** (1986), no. 1, 9–23.

[13] Teif Vladimir B. General transfer matrix formalism to calculate DNA-protein-drug binding in gene regulation: application to O_R operator of phage λ. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **35** (2007), no. 11, 18 pp.

[14] Yang, Winston. Bell numbers and k-trees. *Discrete Math.* **156** (1996), no. 1–3, 247–252.

[15] Ziegler, Günter M., Lectures on polytopes, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*,Vol. 152, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. x+370 pp.